

REMARKS

By this Amendment, claims 19-21 have been amended, and new claim 28 has been added. Claims 1-28 are pending in this application. No new matter has been added. In the Office Action mailed July 12, 2005, claims 19 and 20 were objected to for informalities; claims 21, 25 and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for failing to set forth the subject matter which Applicants regard as their invention; claims 21, 25 and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 for being directed to non-statutory subject matter; and claim 27 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Pub. No. 2003/0079197 to Pannala et al. ("*Pannala*"). Applicants appreciate the Examiner's allowance of claims 1-18 and 22-24. The objections and rejections to the claims are addressed below.

Objection to claims 19 and 20

The Office Action objected to claims 19 and 20 for minor informalities. In view of the amendments made to these claims in this Amendment, Applicants request reconsideration of the objections.

With respect to claim 19, Applicants submit that the objection has been addressed and overcome by the amendments made herein. Although Applicants disagree with the objection to claim 19, in interest of expediting prosecution of the pending application, claim 19 has been amended to recite "a computer-readable memory," as suggested in the Office Action at page 2. Support for the amendment can be found at least on paragraph 6 of the specification.

With respect to claim 20, Applicants submit that the lack of antecedent basis objection has been addressed by the foregoing amendments to the claim. In particular, claim 20 now recites "the design module," rather than "the routing design module." The claimed "design

module” has antecedent support in at least independent claim 19, from which claim 20 depends. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objections and the timely allowance of claims 19 and 20.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph

Claims 21, 25 and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for failing to set forth the subject matter which Applicants regard as their invention. The Examiner states that the “specification at paragraph 6 discloses that it is ‘a system’ that comprises ‘a routing design module,’ not ‘a tool’ as recited.” Office Action at 3. This rejection is respectfully traversed. Applicants point to paragraph 19 of the specification, which states that “computer 105 may be implemented in various environments to provide *tools* for designing a harness.” Fig. 1 shows that routing design module 124 is within computer 105. It follows that the “tool” may include the computer 105, which may include the routing design module 124. Therefore, there is support for a “tool,” as recited in claims 21, 25 and 26.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 21, 25 and 26 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, and the timely allowance of these pending claims.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 21, 25 and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 for being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Although Applicants disagree with the rejection, in interest of expediting prosecution of this application, independent claim 21 has been amended to recite, “a routing design module embodied in computer-readable memory,” as suggested in the Office

Action at page 3. Support for this amendment can be found at least in paragraph 6 of the specification. Claims 25 and 26 depend directly from independent claim 21. Therefore, Applicants request the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 21, 25, and 26 under 35 U.S.C. § 101, and the timely allowance of these pending claims.

Rejection of claim 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Applicants traverse the rejection of independent claim 27 under § 102(e) because *Pannala* fails to anticipate the claim. In order to properly anticipate the claimed invention under 35 U.S.C. § 102, each and every element of the claim at issue must be found, either expressly described or under principles of inherency, in a single prior art reference. Further, “[t]he identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the . . . claim.” *See* M.P.E.P. § 2131. Finally, “[t]he elements must be arranged as required by the claim.” *Id.*

With regard to claim 27, *Pannala* fails to disclose at least the claimed “*establishing guidelines* for designing the element, the guidelines including information reflecting a geometry of the system; and designing the routing element *based on the diagram and the guidelines*.” The Office Action at page 4 alleges that “the guidelines [of *Pannala*] constitute predefined symbols (¶ 0023) and connection strength information techniques (¶¶ 0020, 0022).” This notion is respectfully traversed. *Pannala* teaches that the predefined symbols are merely geometrical symbols authored in a CAD program, drawn from a library of symbols, or defined by a user. ¶¶ 0022 and 0023. Applicants submit that the predetermined geometrical symbols of *Pannala* do not imply “guidelines for designing the element,” as claimed. Rather, they are CAD symbols or identifiers used to schematically represent components in a layout.

Furthermore, *Pannala* teaches that a netlist is sorted according to the connection strengths of node pairs, or symbol pairs, and the sorted netlist is then used by an algorithm to generate a layout. ¶¶ 0020, 0028-0034. In other words, *Pannala* employs an algorithm (¶¶ 0028-0034) to generate a fixed layout 910 (Fig. 9), rather than “*establishing guidelines* for designing the element, the guidelines including information reflecting a geometry of the system; and designing the routing element *based on the diagram and the guidelines*,” as claimed. The node connection strengths are simply predetermined parameters used by *Pannala* to generate the fixed layout 910. *Pannala* does not teach “*establishing guidelines*,” and “*designing the routing element based on the diagram and the guidelines*,” as claimed. As such, *Pannala* does not teach each and every element of claim 27. Newly added claim 28 depends directly from claim 27, and therefore, *Pannala* does not teach each and every element of claim 28 for at least the same reasons. Furthermore, the subject matter recited in claim 28 is similar to the allowable subject matter indicated in the Office Action at page 4. Applicants therefore request withdrawal of the § 102(e) rejection and the timely allowance of claims 27 and 28.

For at least the reasons noted above, Applicants submit that *Pannala* does not disclose or suggest claim 27. It is noted, however, that Applicants reserve their right to submit an appropriate declaration under 37 C.F.R. § 1.131 to remove the rejection in view of *Pannala*.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that pending claims 1-28 are in condition for allowance. Applicants request reconsideration of the application, and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

The Office Action contains a number of statements reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether or not any such statement is identified herein, Applicants decline to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Office Action.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: November 13, 2006

By: 

Roland McAndrews
Reg. No. 41,450